

White Paper

Report ID: 2880518

Application Number: ZA-250640-16

Project Director: Tyrus Miller

Institution: University of California, Santa Cruz

Reporting Period: 9/1/2016-8/31/2017

Report Due: 11/30/2017

Date Submitted: 6/29/2017

UC Santa Cruz Next Generation Humanities PhD Planning Grant

I. What Happened?

This section provides a detailed synopsis of grant activities, regarding: committee meetings, graduate student activities, research conducted with peer institutions, invited sessions with experts, etc. A list of major participants is included as an appendix.

Committee Meetings.

***Sept. 19, 2016.** In this introductory meeting, Project Lead Tyrus Miller briefed the Planning Group (PG) on the NEH Planning Grant program and summarized the thematic goals and foci of our planning, which were: (1) envisioning in its full range the public sphere for Humanities doctoral expertise; (2) adapting doctoral programs to better cultivate opportunities to translate doctoral expertise into the public sphere; and (3) identifying elements of doctoral programs that require change to meet these goals. He stated the foci of our planning of practical measures to help realize these goals as: (1) development of a three-dimensional (multiple, distributed, and layered) doctoral mentorship model; (2) development of a set of supplementary “Course modules” relevant to expanding Humanities career paths; (3) expansion of tracking, networking, internship, and experiential learning opportunities for Humanities doctoral students.

The PG identified five Working Groups related to these goals and foci as follows: (1) Tracking and Engagement; (2) Course Modules; (3) Survey/Focus; (4) Publicize; and (5) Mentorship and IDP. Considering the project’s goals and foci, the Group brainstormed what tasks each Working Group should undertake, and provided suggestions on how the Working Groups should undertake to accomplish those tasks. The Group then prioritized these lists and each member self-selected into an individual Working Group. Based on these groupings and list of task priorities, we created a working structure for each group and an overall project task management-tracking document. We also created a Google Group to facilitate communication and a shared drive for resources and project documents.

***Oct. 20, 2016.** In this meeting, the point person from each Working Group provided a brief progress report on their activity since the last meeting. During breakout sessions, the preliminary tasks for each Working Group were refined and preliminary tasks were identified. Each of the Working Groups identified a research, presentation, and outcome arc relative to their charge. For example, the tracking and engagement group committed to research the status of each Humanities department’s alumni webpage, roster, and tracking process to identify gaps between tracking and engagement already in operation and strategies and opportunities for development. As another example, the course module group committed to gathering research regarding the current program requirements for each department’s graduate degree. They researched other school’s Humanities programs to see what their degree requirements were and to determine the number of units (if any) other schools were using for experiential/practicum courses and how and where UCSC could shift units from existing degree requirements to experiential/practicum courses.

***Nov. 30, 2016.** In this meeting, we discussed the tracking, networking, and engagement of PhD alumni. We reviewed the graduate program alumni page for the History, Philosophy, Literature, Linguistics, and History of Consciousness Departments and contacted each department’s Graduate Program Coordinator to request additional information. Our inquiry focused on identifying how each department tracked their alumni and how their alumni page reported job placement. What our research discovered was that there is no standardization as to the program’s reporting and messaging of this information. For example, some pages provided breakdowns of alumni by year, while some provided a

sampling of alumni from random year sets; only some programs provided dissertation information; some programs provided information on graduates from both their master's program and their PhD program, while others only provided PhD graduate information. In addition, the links for placement information were variously titled: "Placements," "Job Placement," "PhD Program Alumni," "Graduate Placement," "Alumni Placement," and "PhD Recipients." Likewise, there was no uniformity as to where on the program page this information could be found. Additionally, the types of placements listed varied. Most programs did not offer information about alumni in non-academic positions or careers. In light of this information, the Group prioritized the following action items: (1) work with the program with the most developed, comprehensive, and updated alumni page to construct a model of best practices for tracking and reporting this information to current and prospective students; and (2) research information about alumni in non-academic but Humanities-affiliated placements and incorporate this information in what is reported to current and prospective students.

***Dec. 14, 2017.** The Group did not meet in-person during December. However, the Publicize Working Group informed the Committee about the resource library they had been building with literature on the issues of the state of graduate education in the Humanities that they had been gathering during the fall quarter. These documents were distributed to the Group and posted on the Groups shared Google Drive. They included, among others: Weisbuch and Cassuto, *Reforming Doctoral Education, 1990-2015* (2016); Ellison and Eatman, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (2008); Thrift, *The University Life* (2016); Lemann, *The Case for a New Kind of Core* (2016); and Cassuto, *The Graduate School Mess* (2015).

***Jan. 23, 2017.** In this meeting, the Survey/Focus Working Group presented materials about what we know, and don't about the occupations and earnings of Humanities PhDs. The Survey/Focus Group presentation provided information about what fields Humanities graduates were working in; about the Humanists@Work tracking document model; about a comparative study compiled by Stanford University; about information on Humanities' PhD earnings, including information related to gaps in earnings among graduate students; and about case studies of PhD graduates working in non-academic fields like government and university administration. One of the points raised in response to the case studies was that messaging and strategies should be developed to align student expectations with the evidence that the milestone and achievement track for non-academic careers are less predictable and more variable than traditional academic pathways.

***Feb. 22, 2017.** In this meeting, the Survey/Focus Working Group presented information about the UCSC Graduate Student Survey. Topics of discussion included rethinking the framing of desired/expected outcomes re: job placement. The Group discussed survey categories that would break down the barrier between academic v. non-academic employment and how to reformulate questions so persons in the Humanities do not have to make the painful decision to identify themselves as a "non-academic." A second discussion point related to the need to rethink whether to include questions about career orientation and longer time horizons. For example, the survey does not currently ask for a 5+ year out expected outcomes, focusing instead on immediate outcome expectations. Other concerns focused on the language of the survey itself. For example, the Group considered replacing "job" framing with "career" framing.

***Mar. 15, 2017.** In this meeting, we discussed issues related to the Mentorship/IDP Working Group. In preparation for this meeting, we conducted research on how the Humanities graduate programs provide information related to mentoring. This research included information directed at the student: how to find a mentor, how to cultivate a mentor/mentee relationship, and how to set and meet expectations for both parties within that relationship; and at faculty: best practices. We also compiled research and collected materials from nine other institutions about their mentorship programs, policies, and independent development plans. These materials were collected as research into the range of thinking about and presenting information to Humanities graduate students and faculty about mentorship programs,

seminars, and best practices, and individual development plans. A review of the documents highlighted the importance of: (1) creating a distinctive space for shared Humanities and Social Science department mentorship and IDP materials; (2) creating mentorship relationships external to the university; (3) combining self-assessment, personality, skills, and career aspiration questions in a Humanities IDP; (4) focusing on six core competencies (teaching skills, research skills, writing and publication, communication skills, professional development, and leadership and collaboration skills) in a Humanities IDP; and (5) providing information and access to both internal and external resources on mentorship, IDPs, and professional development.

***Apr. 26, 2017.** In this meeting, we discussed program and learning outcomes. Starting from the assumption that learning and program outcomes play an important role in curriculum re-evaluation, which focuses on (1) what the institution wants Humanities students to learn and (2) establishing assessments to identify when students have learned the requisite skills or obtained the requisite knowledge, the we expanded that understanding to a specific focus of the Group, which was (3) how can/do those skills connect Humanities graduates to careers, both inside and outside the academy. We focused on learning and program outcomes related to skills development and values. Skills development included: includes (1) understanding and utilizing research applications and methodologies, (2) writing analyses of that research, (3) problem solving, (4) oral communication, (5) project design and management, and any other professional skills needed for competent participation in a designated profession or field. Values seek to develop those skills needed for responsible ethical participation in a designated profession or field. Some examples of values learning outcomes that could be incorporated into the curriculum are: (1) developing and maintaining competence in a field (importance of continuing education), (2) promoting justices, fairness, and morality; focusing on quality justice, (3) improving the profession, and (4) self-development. After this exercise, the Group noted the following action item: (1) conduct a skills and values brainstorm for some key professional areas with potential affinity for Humanities. The professional areas for discussion are: Non-university Cultural Institutions; Business/Entrepreneurship; Media/Public Communications; Non-university Education (including Teaching Intensive Higher Ed, Secondary Education, Adult Education, Online, etc.); non-faculty College/University Administration; and Policy/Government.

***May 17, 2017.** In this meeting, we reviewed sample questions from the Graduate Student Survey related to: Quality of Program & Faculty; Advisor; Program and Career Preparation; Program Learning Outcomes; Department Climate; Graduate Career Resources (Versatile PhD); Professional Development at UCSC; and Career Expectations. This was a line-item review of a set of sample questions. In terms of messaging, the Group requested the dichotomy referenced throughout the questions be changed from academic/non-academic to faculty/non-faculty. Additions were also made to specifically include questions related to mentoring, advising, learning outcomes, professional development, and career expectations related to non-faculty careers.

Graduate Student Activities and Invited Sessions with Experts.

***Feb. 14, 2017. On-campus Graduate Student Professional Development/Faculty Toolkit Workshops with Stacey Hartman (UCSC Alum; Connected Academics).** This event was split into two workshops. The first served as a graduate student focus group. During the second workshop, attendees read and evaluated the Connected Academic toolkit under development by the MLA.

***Apr. 21, 2017. PhD + Event: NEH Next Generation Town Hall Meeting.** The aim of this event was to update the campus community on the NEH Planning Group's work.. Nathaniel Deutsch from the Executive Committee and current Literature PhD. candidate, Sarah Papazoglakis served as panelists and facilitated a discussion focused discussion related to the following questions: **Community Building:** (1) What are some values/aspects of a strong graduate education/community/program? (2)

What would having a stronger relationship with graduated students look like? **Skills Building:** (1) What type of skills development would be helpful to open-up employment opportunities for Humanities students? (2) What type of skills development would assist Humanities students to understand and articulate how their research and expertise connects to and serves the public sphere? **Relationship Building:** Where do you think are the greatest possibilities for misunderstanding in a graduate student/faculty advisor relationship?

***Apr. 29, 2017. Focus Group Conversation about the NEH Next Generation Grant with UCSC Humanities Alumni.** In this meeting, members from the Executive Committee, Staff Advisors, the Graduate Student Researcher, and Current Student Advisors meet with the Alumni Advisors. Two questions started the discussion: (1) What does the University want from its alumni? And (2) What do alumni want from the University? These questions produced a discussion around three main topics: (1) transparency; (2) research impact; and (3) professionalism/skills development. The group expressed the need for transparency. For example, alumni placement should not be limited to academic placements; rather, the Humanities Division should institutionalize alumni placement in non-academic (non-faculty) careers. This prompted a secondary discussion about how the alums would like to be engaged in the University. One of the suggestions was to use alumni for mock interviews for those students interested in pursuing non-faculty jobs. Another suggestion was to use alumni for situational mentoring. For example, if a student wants to pursue a career in the federal government, the University should reach out to alumni working in that field and facilitate a meeting with the student to discuss things like preparing a secular resume, acquiring professional skills tailored to the field, and provide advice and insight into the interview expectations for that particular field. Regarding research impact, the group expressed the need to teach students how to articulate to persons outside the university, how their research skills and expertise translate into the ability to address problems and issues in the public sphere. The suggestion was made to use alumni video testimonials to inspire students who are interested in a non-faculty career and to educate faculty on how the Humanities research degree can address the needs of employers in non-faculty fields. The final topic discussed related to professionalism skills. Here, the alumni suggested the students could benefit from more attention and direction on non-faculty resume writings, email etiquette, and interviewing skills. We discussed the possibility of conducting short-term 1-2 week courses that would terminate in a product. These products would be maintained in a students' e-document portfolio with a link that the student could share with potential employers.

***May 5, 2017. PhD+ Event: Mentorship.** The aim of this event was to discuss issues related to mentor/mentee relationships including, mentorship models, best practices, expectations and resources. Two main topics emerged from the moderated discussion: structuring the mentorship relationship and mentorship tools. A key point raised early in the discussion was the importance of choosing a mentor who is (to the extent possible) both a personality match and a subject-matter match. The discussion developed into a consideration of the mentorship relationship in terms of phases. The different phases of a graduate program could look something like this: Orientation; pre-QE; Dissertation Writing; Publication; Fellowship; Job Strategy & Search; etc. We discussed how each of these phases has a different focus and thus calls on different skills and levels of attention and responsibility between the student and the advisor. For example, as the phases progress, it is typical, though not universal, that the balance shifts from reliance on a strong personality match to the need for a stronger subject-matter match. Thinking about the arc of the mentorship relationship opened up the discussion to consider specific skills and goals for each phase, which suggested types of best practices that could be developed for optimizing the mentorship relationship within each phase. The second main topic discussed dealt with mentorship tools for students and faculty. Here, we discussed the importance not only of goal setting in terms of scheduling and tracking progress to degree, but also agenda setting to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of student/advisor interactions. Attendees and panelists suggested tools (or

more accurately skills) that should be taught in the mentorship relationship: how to run a public event; how to make a budget; how to write a grant; and how to articulate research to a non-academic audience.

II. What Worked and What Didn't?

Our planning had three main focal areas. The first related to mentorship; the second to skill-development and its relation to the disciplinary curricula of our degree programs; and the third to data collection on current doctoral students and alumni and to alumni outreach and engagement. We were able to make progress on these foci with different degrees of success.

In the case of mentorship, our discussions dovetailed with broader conversations at UC Santa Cruz and UC systemwide about graduate mentorship. In the PG's discussions, we were able to explore problem points in mentoring; research the models of Individual Development Plans (IDP) and introduce the topic of their use; and to identify some groups of students, such as those selected for the SSRC Dissertation Proposal Development program, with whom our mentorship models can be piloted. However, our ability to conduct more detailed discussions with faculty in our Humanities doctoral degree program was somewhat limited, so the work of informing the faculty about new mentorship models and encourage pilot attempts to reform mentorship at program scale mostly lies ahead of us. Moreover, it will require greater formal attention to faculty development and training in mentorship. Another important point to explore further is that there appeared to be relatively stark divergences between faculty conceptions of what mentorship is / should be and what graduate students are seeking from the mentorship relation. It may be that our "three dimensional" mentorship model, in practice, will provide a richer set of points of mentorship contact and help bridge this gap between the desires of graduate students and the limits of faculty time, training, and commitment as mentors. We also need more detailed faculty and administrative discussion about how good mentorship is evaluated, awarded, and possibly incentivized by doctoral programs. In general, there are few formal guidelines or procedures for Humanities regarding the graduate mentorship relation, nor has it been the subject of much departmental or divisional discussion. The Division of Graduate Studies is seeking to engage the Academic Senate's Graduate Council and the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning on the topic of graduate mentorship over the course of the next academic year; the work of the NEH PG will be an important source of information and ideas for that discussion.

We made the least progress towards our goal of planning course modules for cultivating transferable skills beyond disciplinary expertise and reconciling them with the disciplinary curricula of our various doctoral programs. This work remained at the relatively preliminary planning stage, with group brainstorming about possible topic areas, background research into the curricula of the different programs, and some very preliminary discussions with department chairs and a few department faculties. The most fruitful part of our planning on this topic was our consideration of Humanities-general learning outcomes and values, which helped us to identify gaps not addressed by the discipline-specific curricula. Having identified areas of need, we are better equipped to target our efforts and resources for courses / workshops / events outside of the departmental curricula. However, there remains the problem of opening up time and encouraging doctoral students to avail themselves of these opportunities, not merely as an add-on to their already substantial burdens but as a recognized part of their movement through the milestones of their programs. Progress on creating a greater degree of flexibility in program requirements, in parallel with developing targeted, high quality courses to cultivate relevant transferable skills, will require much more extensive consultation with faculty. Ultimately, the faculty of the programs "own" the doctoral curricula and requirements, and they must be actively engaged in any possible reform of the sort we envisioned in our planning. For that, more time and effort is required than was possible this year.

Our most tangible progress, including some degree of immediate implementation, was in the area of current student and alumni data collection and in engaging alumni to help better inform PhD career pathways. We discussed extensively the biannually administered graduate student survey, with particular focus on mentorship (including mentorship about careers beyond the academy), career aspirations and professional development, and departmental support for different kinds of career pathways. For the first time, this year the Division of Graduate Studies awarded distinguished alumni awards for the different academic divisions (including Humanities) and presented them at a luncheon during alumni weekend, to which we invited alumni, faculty, and current students, encouraging their interaction and networking. We also conducted a focus-group session with the Humanities alumni, and an invited dinner for alumni and current students to meet and mingle. Lastly, we held two alumni panel discussions that included Humanities alumni, one on leadership and the other on entrepreneurship. On another related front, we encouraged departments to update the websites with enhanced information about alumni careers, with particular attention to filling the significant gaps that exist in their information about alumni who pursued careers outside the academy. Drawing from best practices exhibited by a few of our Humanities programs, the Department of Literature, UC Santa Cruz's largest Humanities graduate program, has committed to a summer project of assembling and posting complete (to the extent possible) information about the career paths of their decades of doctoral alumni. Similarly, the Institute for Humanities Research, which awards doctoral fellowships, will complete tracking of its past fellows and continue with new cohorts. Lastly, as a culmination of our efforts in improving alumni tracking, UC Santa Cruz applied, as part of a ten-campus University of California systemwide consortium, including also the UC Office of the President and the UC Humanities Research Institute, for the Council of Graduate Schools grant for tracking Humanities doctoral graduates (funded by the Mellon Foundation) and STEM-field doctoral graduates (funded by NSF); NEH Next Gen Project Lead Tyrus Miller is also lead PI on the CGS PhD Career Pathways proposal. This grant, though somewhat different in scope than the tracking / engagement goals of the NEH Next Gen grant, represents an opportunity to implement a key element of the Next Gen goals: to gain better data about our Humanities doctoral alumni's career paths, and to build the institutional research infrastructure to continue to collect, analyze, and apply this data for programmatic improvements in Humanities graduate education.

We were relatively successful in engaging a range of stakeholders, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students in the planning committee. It was, however, most difficult to get consistent participation of faculty, who are among the most important constituencies who will evaluate ideas and suggestions coming from the planning process and who exercise a great deal of influence over the implementation of any recommended programmatic and curricular reforms. Moreover, it limited the degree to which we could mobilize well-informed faculty "champions" in the full range of Humanities departments, which would make the task of opening up channels of communication with the broader faculty easier. It was, therefore, disappointing that we were not able to get broader and more consistent faculty participation throughout the full planning year. It is possible that the "volunteer" nature of the PG led to lower levels of commitment by faculty—even those manifestly positive about the Next Gen goals—when pressures of teaching and other service became heavy. It might be worth considering modest incentives, such as some research funds, to help encourage and enforce consistent participation by faculty. A modest outlay of funds might similarly help keep graduate students to participate consistently: we had student participants who were highly committed, but also a few who dropped out after one or two meetings.

We had a relatively difficult time managing broad faculty outreach beyond the PG during the year-long timeframe of the grant. Project lead Tyrus Miller met twice with the chairs of the departments in the Humanities division, on the invitation of the dean. A two-page brief, inviting further discussion, was prepared and distributed to department faculty in February. Two events late in the academic year, a town hall event about the Next Gen planning and a session on mentorship (including discussion of our

Next Gen multiple / distributed / layered mentorship model), had substantial participation by individual faculty members from different Humanities departments. Tyrus Miller also participated in a general Literature department faculty discussion of the Next Gen project. However, we found that the PG needed several meetings to really be prepared with substantive topics and information to discuss with faculty, and with the demands of graduate admissions and other Winter/Spring quarter business, it was difficult to schedule Next Gen discussions during heavily-encumbered faculty meeting times. We aim to carry on this work of discussion and communication about our Next Gen planning, but we recognize that some momentum may have been lost by not being able to do more during the planning year, concurrently with the PG's convenings and the other events organized under the Next Gen aegis.

It was also somewhat difficult to figure out how to best engage the alumni members of the PG. In only one case were we able to have an alumna member call in on meetings throughout the year. Other alumni members we engaged more sporadically, by sharing reports and giving them access to information, by meeting with them on travel to cities where they live or at conferences, and by inviting them to UC Santa Cruz's Alumni weekend events, which included a focus group meeting and panel discussions. While this was a definite advance and their input was invaluable, it may be that a separate alumni council or analogous structure might be a necessary means of engaging them more consistently and effectively.

We were very appreciative of the opportunity to meet with the Next Gen consortium members in person at the Washington meeting, from which we came away inspired and better informed about the range of Next Gen projects and institutions. Although we also appreciated the opportunity to connect via the webinars, in practice we found these difficult to work into our schedules on a consistent basis, so they ended up being a less meaningful mode of participation in the consortium. We made site visits to three Humanities centers as part of our grant activities: to one consortium member, CUNY Graduate Center, and to two additional centers, at Arizona State University and the University of Washington. Outside the Washington meeting, we also spoke in other contexts with consortium members about their projects, particularly with the other three University of California campuses (Berkeley, Santa Barbara, Irvine) and the University of Texas, El Paso.

III. What Does It All Mean?

The first observation we would make with respect to the assessment of our activities is that the overall framework of planning and discussion that the Next Gen grant provided was exceedingly valuable for our campus. It provided a regular forum—underwritten by the prestige of recognition by the NEH and our inclusion in the Next Generation PhD Consortium—for a series of candid and penetrating discussions about key aspects of Humanities doctoral education. The mandated task of assembling a broad planning group, including administrators, faculty, staff, students, and alumni catalyzed conversations that would have otherwise been far more difficult to organize, though valuable and necessary to have. Moreover, it engaged a highly skilled group of university stakeholders in the work of identifying key topics and issues, performing research and analysis, and communicating with the group and broader groups on the UC Santa Cruz campus. The Next Gen planning heightened the awareness of the existing excellence and potentials of our Humanities doctoral programs, and also of the interdependent nature of the different campus stakeholders that support them and contribute to their success. Despite the limits on our ability to fully engage departmental faculty in in-depth conversation, the meetings with department chairs, the two general forums, and other conversations and meetings did help to seed further discussion and create a greater environment of openness to exploring the Next Gen goals within the degree programs. History and Literature specifically, two of the largest doctoral programs in the Humanities at UC Santa Cruz, have begun these conversations, and we expect that they, along with other departments, will continue to focus on topics such as broad professional and

pedagogical preparation of doctoral students, encouragement of internships and other program-external training opportunities, graduate mentorship, and the engagement of alumni with the programs and their current students.

Especially valuable was also the engagement of staff experts in areas such as research management and development, institutional research and planning, and alumni relations. Typically, these experts are relatively disconnected in their daily work from contact with faculty and students (especially in the Humanities), and in cases where the PG's discussion touched on areas such as our survey research with graduate students, staff members of the PG appreciated receiving direct and detailed input about areas under their responsibility. The academic members of the PG, in turn, gained greater appreciation of the range and depth of staff expertise in areas of concern to them, and benefited from their perspectives, insights, and energetic engagement. One of our stated goals was to help bridge the gap between graduate students and staff experts (many with PhDs and advanced research skills and experience as well as diverse professional experience) and to open pathways to meaningful mentorship relations, whether informal or formal. A necessary part of realizing this goal also includes informing faculty better about the expertise of our high-level staff and changing perceptions about their potential contribution to doctoral student training. UC Santa Cruz has already established an internship / training program in library curatorial skills, the CART program, in which graduate students, under the mentorship of research librarians, work on cataloguing and annotating unprocessed materials in our special collections and develop exhibits and events around these materials; CART graduate students also this year presented their work in a poster presentation in our annual Graduate Research Symposium, highlighting the connection of Humanities doctoral training to research skills in primary materials. We are further expanding our internship and training ambit through the Graduate Division's awarding of Chancellor's Graduate Internships to two Humanities students. One intern is connecting topical undergraduate course development to community outreach through a film festival and association with local entrepreneurship; the other will focus on doctoral student professional and skill development under the supervision of our Institute for Humanities Research. In addition, one of our recent Humanities doctoral alumna has been hired as the assistant director of our newly founded Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning. This appointment represent both an important example of excellent non-faculty employment following completion of a Humanities PhD and a valuable institutional connection back to our Humanities doctoral programs, helping to strategically enhance our pedagogical and professional training.

Beyond the role that the Next Gen grant had in constituting a community of engaged participants in critical questions about our graduate Humanities, we also were able to take the various planning topics as elements for further elaboration. Our Next Gen planning work has tangibly affected our ability to seek external funds for implementation. During the period of the NEH planning grant, UC Santa Cruz has had a remarkable run of successes in applying for other grants that allow us to extend our planning in key areas and to implement certain planned activities in part or in full. For example, we were selected as one of five institutions to pilot a campus-sited version of the Social Science Research Council's Dissertation Proposal Development program, which at UC Santa Cruz includes doctoral students from Humanities and Arts as well as Social Sciences. Our thinking about the components of the UCSC-SSRC dissertation proposal development program was directly informed by the NEH PG's discussions of the multiple goals and genres of humanistic doctoral research, and our NEH-supported planning work positively impacted the quality of our proposal and has informed the on-going design of our SSRC-DPD workshops. UC Santa Cruz has also recently received five years of funding from the Mellon Foundation for a range of activities in the Humanities, but especially related to professional and pedagogical development of doctoral students, to Humanities graduate student diversity and student success, and to the public impact of Humanities research and teaching conducted by doctoral students. The activities we proposed to carry out with Mellon support were strongly informed by our planning under the NEH Next

Gen grant, and we view these activities, broadly, as a mode of implementing a number of goals and ideas that emerged from this planning. They include pre-matriculation and pre-candidacy summer workshops for Humanities doctoral students from underrepresented and underserved backgrounds; course development and teaching of undergraduate courses associated with our publically oriented “Questions That Matter” events; and the expansion of our Humanities public fellows program, including both summer fellowships and internships and three year-long public fellows. Also, as mentioned earlier, our planning via the Next Gen program has strengthened our alumni tracking and outreach efforts, including NEH Next Gen Project Lead Tyrus Miller’s role as lead PI in a proposal for the Council of Graduate School’s PhD Career Pathways initiative. It would be accurate to say that not only did the NEH Next Gen planning grant catalyze new conversation and ideas; it also helped consolidate Humanities stakeholders around a set of coherently interconnected goals, which has allowed us also to seek external resources more strategically to help us implement our plans.

We emerge from this year of planning with an even stronger perception of two co-existing judgments about our Humanities programs. First, we are even more powerfully convinced of the excellence of our programs, the quality of the faculty that teach in them, the talents of the students we recruit into them, and the value of the research and pedagogical experience that our doctoral students gain by completing PhDs in them. But second, we also perceive that we, institutionally and in the teaching and mentorship we offer our students, are not fully realizing the extraordinary potential of these programs. The stark tendencies affecting the Humanities disciplines in universities and colleges, from the downsizing and consolidation of departments, to the continuing tightening of the academic job market, to the decline in undergraduate majors and enrollments, to a pervasively negative public discourse about the Humanities in many venues, have rendered the already-questionable, but tacitly-held assumption that doctoral programs should only prepare students for a mono-vocational path into tenure-track faculty positions manifestly untenable. A year of planning work has identified several areas where we can make improvements and generated new ideas for how we might begin to adapt to this current reality; but it has also made even starker our awareness of how much hard work is still needed to formulate an adequate response to the deep, enduring changes that we are experiencing in the institutional status of the Humanities.

In addition, we must reiterate a point that we made already in our proposal and which was reinforced by our planning discussions. Recent attention to the application of Humanities PhD expertise beyond tenure-track academic employment has been salutary, if insufficient and often reactive rather than forward-looking, positive, and innovative. This discussion has in particular helped to highlight the transferrable skills that Humanities scholars develop during their graduate training, question the factors that lead to unnecessarily long times-to-degree and costly attrition at advanced stages, and underscore the special ties between teaching and research in the humanistic disciplines—each important topics that can spur positive reforms in Humanities doctoral education. However, while general soft skills and, particularly, heightened pedagogical expertise are indeed valuable outcomes of doctoral programs, we believe advocates of the graduate Humanities must emphasize with confidence the most important distinguishing feature of PhD degree holders (from MAs or professional degree holders): their extensive experience with conducting research, their ability to communicate that research effectively, and their capacity to carry out new research in the future. The PhD is definitively a *research* and *research communication* degree, and even as we rethink the Humanities PhD’s “next generation,” we should hold on to this distinctive feature and seek to realize its full value both within *and outside* the academy. In a knowledge and innovation economy, more and more professional work—from commercial and entrepreneurial venture to government and public institutions—requires advanced research, and not solely on scientific and technical problems, but also on the social, psychological, cultural, historical, and aesthetic dimensions of contemporary life. Moreover, in a social environment characterized by pervasive computing and the proliferation of “big data,” there is escalating need for specialists trained in the

culturally and ethically sensitive interpretation of information—indeed, in the full spectrum of humanistic meaning-making in an information-saturated world, from basic emotional and cognitive elements to the richest of historical, ethical, and spiritual dimensions. To our detriment, academic humanists have recognized this growing need for their expertise in very uneven and often overly passive ways, so that one could legitimately speak of an advocacy and communication gap for the Humanities in the public and commercial spheres, whose institutions for their part have too often handled nuanced issues clumsily, with sometimes disastrous results. We viewed the goals of our “Next Generation” planning in this light and continue to maintain that PhD research in the Humanities be valued not solely as a ticket to an academic position, but as professionally transferable and translatable in a number of socially and personally valuable types of work. We must continue to expand our shared understanding of the potential impacts of Humanities doctoral expertise in contemporary society and communicate about them effectively; to engage in creative exploration of job innovation, the invention of new modes of putting the Humanities “to work”; and, through programmatic reform of our doctoral program, to expand opportunities for our doctoral students to realize the public value of their humanistic expertise in a evolving, diversifying institutional and professional frame.

IV. What’s Next?

As noted above, UC Santa Cruz will be utilizing the ideas and initiatives explored in the Next Gen planning efforts in a variety of contexts of implementation. Most important and extensive are, as noted, our Mellon Foundation funded initiatives, which in many respects can be viewed as a direct implementation of aspects of our Next Gen planning; our SSRC Dissertation Proposal Development program, which will include aspects of mentorship and professional development informed by the Next Gen planning; and our enhanced data collection, alumni tracking, and alumni engagement, which follow directly from our Next Gen initiatives.

Other areas of implementation that we will continue to work on include:

- Developing internal and external messaging that non-University tenure-track positions are successful outcomes for Humanities PhD graduates on par with tenure-track University positions. The Graduate Division and the Institute for Humanities Research have taken the lead in profiling on their websites and other communications graduate student successes beyond tenure track employment.
- Conducting additional research into non-academic employer information relevant to Humanities doctoral graduates, particularly in companies employing UC Santa Cruz Alumni.
- Collecting data on how many students terminate their doctoral program after completing the requirements for a master’s degree. Collect and analyze data, possibly through an exit survey to determine whether discontinuation of a doctoral program is linked to students’ expectations and intentions regarding non-academic employment outcomes.
- Completing summer pilot project to track all Literature PhD alumni and all Institute for Humanities Fellows.
- Designing outreach strategies to connect with cultural institutions as potential sources of internships and post-graduation employment.
- Assessing the Public Fellows Program with a view to extracting structural components to serve as a model for experiential/apprenticeship requirements, experiences, or programs.
- Developing a Graduate Humanities Advocacy Toolkit. This would address the general question of what is the value of a Humanities graduate education as well as the secondary question of what does UC Santa Cruz offer to serve those values. The advocacy arguments should run parallel to the reforms the Planning Group has suggested for Humanities doctoral programs.
- Identify mentorship training needs and create opportunities for education.

Appendix: Major Participants.

- **Executive Committee:**
Tyrus Miller, Vice Provost and Dean, Graduate Studies (Project Director); Professor of Literature
Tyler Stovall, Dean of Humanities; President-Elect of American Historical Association
Nathaniel Deutsch, Director, Institute for Humanities Research; Professor of History
Irena Polić, Associate Director, Institute for Humanities Research
- **Faculty Advisors:**
Jon Ellis, Professor of Philosophy; Director, Center for Public Philosophy
Sean Keilen, Provost, Porter College; Associate Professor of Literature
Susan Gillman, Professor of Literature
Jim McCloskey, Professor of Linguistics
Grace Peña Delgado, Associate Professor of History
Lisa Rofel, Professor of Anthropology
- **Staff Advisors:**
Tedd Siegel, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research
Rachel Deblinger, Digital Humanities Specialist, McHenry University Library
Cari Napoles, Director of Development, Humanities Division
John Weber, Institute for Arts and Sciences
Shayna Kent, Director, Alumni Engagement
Stephanie Moore, Research Grants Coordinator, Division of the Arts
Anna Sher, Assistant Director, Assessment, Institutional Research, Assessment & Policy Studies
- **Graduate Student Researcher:**
Laura Cisneros, PhD Candidate, History of Consciousness; Professor of Law, Golden Gate University School of Law
- **Alumni Advisors:**
Jason Jacobs, Associate Dean of General Education; Associate Professor of Foreign Languages, Roger Williams College***
Kelly Ann Brown, PhD Alumna, Literature; Assistant Director, UC Humanities Research Institute at UC Irvine; project lead on Humanities@Work initiative
Laurel Voloder, PhD Alumna, Literature; Program Analyst, US Department of State
Laurel Recker, PhD, English, University of California, Davis
- **Current Student Advisors:**
Whitney DeVos, PhD Candidate, Literature
Sarah Papazoglakis, PhD Candidate, Literature